

ID. Date of interview
date 11/02/20

ID. Time interview started
start 14:55:50

ID.end Completion date of interview
Date 11/02/20

ID.end Time interview ended
14:58:55

ID. Duration of interview
time 3.08

new case

ICO consultation on the draft right of access
guidance

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, what other issues would you like to be covered in it?

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

Q4 We have found that data protection professionals often struggle with applying and defining 'manifestly unfounded or excessive' subject access requests. We would like to include a wide range of examples from a variety of sectors to help you. Please provide some examples of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests below (if applicable).

We have no examples of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?

1 - Not at all useful	2 – Slightly useful	3 – Moderately useful	4 – Very useful	5 – Extremely useful
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Q6 Why have you given this score?

Our I.G. team have recently undertaken an in depth review of the way we process subject access requests, and made several changes and refinements to improve the process from the customers' perspective, as well as implementing an efficient process which links to performance reports. The draft guidance has given the team confidence and reassurance, as it has reinforced that the changes made within the new process are correct, and the right approach is being taken. The team also found the guidance relating to when a request is complex, and the exemptions guidance very helpful in confirming the understanding of the legislation, along with the guidance on dealing with requests that come via third party online portals which is an area we had not considered.

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

The draft guidance, be it a lengthy document, is very useful and covers all areas of guidance required in relation to the right of access to information (SAR). What may be helpful would be if a key points document could be produced alongside the full guidance document.

Q9 Are you answering as:

- ☐ An individual acting in a private capacity (eg someone providing their views as a member of the public)
- ☐ An individual acting in a professional capacity
- ☒ On behalf of an organisation
- ☐ Other

Please specify the name of your organisation:

Wakefield Metropolitan District Council

What sector are you from:

Local Authority

Q10 How did you find out about this survey?

- ☐ ICO Twitter account
- ☐ ICO Facebook account
- ☐ ICO LinkedIn account
- ☒ ICO website
- ☐ ICO newsletter
- ☐ ICO staff member
- ☐ Colleague
- ☐ Personal/work Twitter account
- ☐ Personal/work Facebook account
- ☐ Personal/work LinkedIn account
- ☐ Other

If other please specify: